



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

goes too far, however, in making invariability a critical canon; as the possibility of an occasional interchange of "I" and "we" by a poet must be admitted, so something must be granted to poetic metrical license; still, these changes of form will always excite suspicion, and invite one to look for signs of composite structure and interpolation. Grimme further finds in the metric alternations a mark of date: in Book I the number of the unvarying psalms is the greatest (the measure is prevailingly quaternary [4-beat], which he thinks the oldest); the variation increases constantly in Books II, III, IV, while Book V shows a partial return to the "older" norm. This is a legitimate inquiry, but its results will depend on the inquirer's metrical construction of the psalms; on this point there is great difference of opinion, and not all persons will agree with Grimme's enumeration of quaternary and ternary forms; his result, however, so far as regards Books I-IV, is that which has been reached, on other grounds, by the majority of critics, though it is one that calls for some serious modifications.

For strophic structure in the Psalter Grimme regards as the only sure guides the *Selah* and the refrain. The latter is generally accepted; the former remains a *crux criticorum*, and Grimme's investigation cannot be said to dissolve our doubts. He himself finds strophes where there is no *Selah*, and *Selahs* where there is no strophe; nor does he hesitate to deal arbitrarily with the *Selah*, displacing it, and changing the text to bring it in, as seems good to him.

From an examination of various diacritical marks Grimme reaches the conclusion that the *Paseq*-*Legarmeh* (both the point and the vertical line) indicates text-variants; he illustrates his conclusion by a comparison between the Hebrew *Paseq*-passages and the readings of the versions. The possibility that this was the function of *Paseq* need not be denied (it is favored by the Tiberian circle and asterisk), but the resulting advantage to the present-day critic is small, because it is impossible to say to what sort of error of text (or whether to any at all) *Paseq* refers in any particular case, and because there are many errors that are not marked by a *Paseq*.

Though Grimme does not satisfactorily sustain his main theses, he furnishes in this volume a mass of interesting and valuable material.

C. H. TOY.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

DALMAN'S ARAMAIC LEXICON.¹

The second part of this dictionary does not in its general make-up differ from the first part, and what could be said of the latter is true of this.² Of "corrected" biblical words we find here מִפְּחֵ, מִצְּדָר, נֶפֶל, תְּבִלְיָל, רְעִבּוֹן for the correct מִפְּחָה, מִצְּדָר, נֶפֶל, תְּבִלְיָל, רְעִבּוֹן. For

¹ ARAMÄISCH-NEUHEBRÄISCHES WÖRTERBUCH ZU TARGUM, TALMUD UND MIDRASCH, mit Vokalisation der targumischen Wörter nach sudarabischen Handschriften und besonderer Bezeichnung des Wortschatzes des Onkelostargum, bearbeitet von Gustaf H. Dalman. Teil II. Frankfurt a. M.: J. Kauffmann, 1901. Pp. iv+181-447; 8vo.

² Cf. this JOURNAL, Vol. XV, p. 57.

כְּבִיא, כְּבִיא should be read כְּבִיא, כְּבִיא. כְּבִיא, כְּבִיא are not to be changed to כְּבִיא (sic), but are to be read כְּבִיא, כְּבִיא, this form being a Palestinian Aramaic plural. כְּבִיא is not to be "corrected" to כְּבִיא, as little as the author himself corrects the identical forms פְּחִימָא, חֲמִימָא. We have here a change of accented *i* to *e*, as in the Ma'lûlâ and other dialects. For כּוּבְסָא read כּוּבְסָא; it is a form like עִיבְדָא. כּוּבִיא is correct and must not be read כּוּבִיא. For פְּרִיא read פְּרִיא; cf. the spelling כּוּרִיא. כּוּרִיא is not *καρταλλος*; this is קְרִטָל and טְרִסְקָל; it is good Semitic from $\sqrt{\text{כול}}$, and must be vocalized כּוּרִיא. כּוּרִיא belongs to מִסְתָּא. כְּסָא (sub כְּסָא) is forbidden by the constant spelling without י; read פְּסָא or כְּסָא. כּוּרְבָחָא has nothing to do with *κρωβυλος*, but is = כְּרִבְלָחָא, good Semitic; cf. my *Grammar*, § 981. כְּרִשָּׂא is translated "eine Fischart;" read Haifisch = Arab. فَرْش. For לִוִּי read לִוִּי. For לִוִּי read, with Bacher, לִוִּי; the spelling לִוִּי, לִוִּי does not permit a form לִוִּי, nor does the sense. The author was misled by Bacher, *Die älteste Terminologie*, s. v., who explains לִוִּי as "begleiteter Name," but it really means "an accompanying name," i. e., an additional definition to the name. For מְלַחָת read מְלַחָת. Although Hebrew permits vocalizations like לֶחֶם, it does not permit the *e* in similar forms before the feminine ending. מְלַח is not permitted by the spelling מִלַּח; read מְלַח. The word stands for מְלַח ($\sqrt{\text{מלל}}$), like אִשָּׁת for אִשָּׁת. מְנוּבִיחָא read מְנוּבִיחָא; cf. my *Grammar*, p. 216, n. 2. For מִן אִידֵּה read "wer ist er" (s. v. מִנִּי) read מִן אִידֵּה "wer ist sie," correctly stated s. v. מִן. For מְעַגִּיל read מְעַגִּיל. For "Anschliessung" (s. v. מְעִיט) read Ausschliessung. מְקָרָא is the same as מְקָרָא; on etymology cf. *Levias* in this JOURNAL, Vol. XVI, p. 250. For מְקָרָא read מְקָרָא. For מְרִע read מְרִע; for מְרִיב read מְרִיב. For מְרִע read מְרִע; this stands for מְרִעָא, as Hebrew מְרִיב for מְרִיבָא; $\sqrt{\text{עריש}} = \sqrt{\text{ערש}}$. For נְגִיב (s. v. נְגִיב) read נְגִיב. For "Polal" (s. v. נִיר) read Popal. For נְמִי read נְמִי. For נְמִירִי read נְמִירִי. נְסִיס, נְסִיסָא, נְסִיס have no connection with *νόσος*, but are good Semitic. The Hebrew and Aramaic $\sqrt{\text{נש}}$ is a differentiation of $\sqrt{\text{נש}}$ נִשָּׁא, נִשָּׁא, just as כְּנִס is the same as כְּנִשָּׁא. With this is connected $\sqrt{\text{נש}}$ אִנְסָא = בְּעַל פְּרָחָא, or בְּעַל פְּרָחָא, אִנְסָא "sickness." For נְעִמִית read נְעִמִית. For "Schütten" (s. v. נְעִיב) read Schütteln. For הֶחְלָב (s. v. נִץ) read הֶחְלָב. For נְפִט read, with tradition and Aramaic נְפִטָא, נְפִט; it is an exact counterpart of נְרִיב. נְשָׂא (s. v. נְשָׂא) read נְשָׂא (cf. my *Grammar*, p. 206, n. 2, where correct form, translation, and explanation are given). For סְחָרָא (falsch סְחָרָא) read סְחָרָא (falsch סְחָרָא). The article סְחָרָא is uselessly

C. LEVIAS.